

Chapter 5

Consultation and Coordination

Introduction

This chapter describes the public participation opportunities and outreach made available throughout development of the Proposed Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement (Proposed RMP/Final EIS). This chapter also describes consultation and coordination efforts with tribes; federal, state and local agencies; and other stakeholders.

This Proposed RMP/Final EIS was prepared by an interdisciplinary team of resource specialists, identified at the end of this chapter, from the South Dakota Field Office (SDFO) in Belle Fourche, South Dakota, and the Montana/Dakotas State Office in Billings, Montana. Technical review and support were provided by cooperators, and the State of South Dakota.

Butte, Harding, and Meade Counties along with the State of South Dakota participated as cooperating agencies in the development of this Proposed RMP/Final EIS. The Dakota Resource Advisory Council (RAC) also participated, and a discussion of their involvement is included later in this chapter. Custer, Lawrence and Pennington Counties signed on as Cooperating Agencies and were invited to Cooperating Agency meetings but did not attend meetings on a regular basis.

Members of the planning team have consulted formally and informally with numerous agencies, groups, and individuals during the preparation of this document. Consultation, coordination, and public involvement occurred as a result of scoping meetings, briefings, and meetings with federal, state, tribal, and local government representatives, informal meetings, and individual contacts.

Public Participation Opportunities

Public outreach to inform and involve the public about the planning process and the Proposed RMP/Final EIS has been ongoing throughout this RMP process. The public was invited to participate in development of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS prior to its release for public review and comment. A press release with regional distribution was issued at the start of the scoping process to announce scoping meetings/open houses, and an informational fact sheet was distributed to a general mailing list.

In addition to informing the public through news releases and announcements, a website for the South Dakota RMP (http://www.blm.gov/mt/st/en/fo/south_dakota_field/rmp.html) was launched to provide access to planning documents, calendars, process information, and other updates. The website continues to be updated as changes occur to provide status reports and new information on the planning process. Major public participation events are described in more detail below.

Scoping

Scoping is the term used in the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (40 CFR, part 1500 et seq.) to define the early and open process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed in the planning process. The scoping process identifies land use issues, conflicts, and opportunities. These issues may stem from new information or changed circumstances, the need to address environmental protection concerns, or a need to reassess the appropriate mix of allowable uses based on new information. Scoping is the first stage of the planning process and closely involves the public in identifying issues, providing resource and other information, and developing planning criteria to guide document preparation.

A Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare the Proposed RMP/Final EIS was published in the Federal Register on July 19, 2007. This notice served as the beginning of the BLM's formal scoping process.

The BLM distributed press releases and public service announcements to South Dakota newspapers and television and radio stations, and prepared outreach materials, including fact sheets and informational flyers to distribute at meetings and in

communities. The outreach materials provided an overview of the planning process and the importance of BLM public lands and mineral estate within the state of South Dakota.

Scoping meetings were organized in an open house format designed to encourage broad public participation, allow attendees to learn about the project and specific resources/resource uses, and encourage information discussions between the public and BLM resource specialists. Fact sheets that described preliminary planning criteria, project milestones, and information about the BLM were prepared and distributed. Site and resource maps and posters were displayed illustrating the importance of resources and management techniques practiced among different resources and land areas. A presentation highlighted key issues and summarized the planning process. The BLM hosted nine scoping open house meetings from August to October 2007.

To accommodate and encourage public participation, public scoping meetings were held with two separate open sessions: one session from 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. and another session from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. Posters, maps, and an overview slide presentation were used to provide information about the planning process and resources/resource uses in the planning area. The SDFO received 24 written submittals as a result of scoping efforts. All submittals indicated an interest in BLM public land and resource management. Many submittals offered substantive comments, while others conveyed a desire or an opinion. A total of 370 individual comments were analyzed and considered by resource specialists as part of this Proposed RMP/Final EIS.

Draft RMP and EIS Public Comment Period

The BLM published the Notice of Availability (NOA) for the South Dakota Draft RMP and EIS for public review and comment in the Federal Register on June 14, 2013. The NOA initiated the 90-day public comment period for this document. During this comment period, the BLM held public meetings in Belle Fourche, Buffalo, Pierre, Rapid City, and Sturgis, South Dakota. The meetings were held with an open house format and started with a Power Point Presentation about the planning process and the Draft SD RMP, followed by a question and answer period. The attendees were then asked to visit various stations and review maps and information about the RMP. Comment forms were provided at the meeting and attendees visited with various resource specialists that have served as interdisciplinary team members on the RMP planning team. **Table 5-1**, Public Comment Meetings, provides a summary of the meetings that were held.

Table 5-1 Public Comment Meetings	
<i>Date</i>	<i>Location</i>
7/8/13	Belle Fourche, South Dakota
7/9/13	Buffalo, South Dakota
7/11/13	Sturgis, South Dakota
7/19/13	Rapid City, South Dakota
7/23/13	Pierre, South Dakota

Notification letters about the Draft RMP were sent to all individuals and organizations that had been notified during scoping except for the parties that requested to be taken off of the mailing list. Additional individuals or organizations were added to the mailing list upon request. Prior to the comment period, BLM sent out a mailing list update form and requested that each person or group on the mailing list state their preference for the type of media that would like to use for review of the document. Based on the preference indicated, printed copies or CDs of the Draft RMP/EIS were sent to those that requested them and electronic copies were made available on the BLM South Dakota Field Office website. Notification of the location of electronic version of the RMP and associated documents were mail to all groups or individual on the mailing list. GIS data and maps were also made available on this same website. In addition to the notification letters, BLM made phone calls to affected Local, State and Federal Agencies and Tribes to notify them that the Draft RMP and EIS was available for review and comment.

A total of 48 comment letters, forms, and emails were received during the 90 day public comment period. These documents resulted in 322 substantive comments. Out of the 48 comment letters, 15 were submitted by private individuals (31 percent), 14 by environmental protection groups (29 percent), 7 by associations (15 percent), 6 by federal agencies (13 percent), 4 by local government agencies (8 percent), 1 by state government agencies (2 percent), and 1 by industry groups (2 percent). 130 comments were submitted by environmental and wildlife protection groups and organizations (40 percent of all comments), 88 comments by federal agencies (27 percent), 33 by state government agencies (10 percent), 25 by industry groups (8 percent), 20 by associations (6 percent), 14 by local government (4 percent), and 12 by private individuals (4 percent, see **Table 5-2**, Number of Submissions and Comments by Affiliation).

Table 5-2 Number of Submissions and Comments by Affiliation		
<i>Group</i>	<i>Number of Submissions</i>	<i>Number of Comments</i>
Private individuals	15	12
Environmental and wildlife protection groups and organizations	14	130
Associations (user groups, recreational clubs, realty associations, industry associations, partnerships, etc.)	7	20
Federal agencies (EPA, USFWS, USFS, NPS)	6	88
Local government (county commissions and departments)	4	14
Industry groups (pipeline companies, energy companies, utility companies, transmission companies)	1	25
State government (state agencies, Governor's Office)	1	33
Total	48	322

Comment Analysis

The BLM received comment letters (submissions) by mail, e-mail, fax, and submitted/hand-delivered. The comments covered a wide spectrum of thoughts, ideas, opinions and concerns. According to NEPA, BLM is required to identify and formally respond to all substantive public comments. Substantive comments from each comment submission were coded to appropriate categories based on content of the comment. The categories generally follow the sections presented in the Draft RMP, although some relate to the planning process.

Although all comments were considered, the comment analysis process involves determining whether a comment was substantive or non-substantive in nature. In performing the analysis, BLM relied on the CEQ's regulations to determine what constitutes a substantive comment.

A substantive comment does one or more of the following:

- Questions, with a reasonable basis, the accuracy of the information and/or analysis in the EIS;
- Questions, with a reasonable basis, the adequacy of the information and/or analysis in the EIS;
- Presents reasonable alternatives other than those presented in the Draft EIS that meet the purpose and need of the proposed action and addresses significant issues;
- Questions, with a reasonable basis, the merits of an alternative or alternatives;
- Causes changes in or revisions to the proposed action; and
- Questions, with a reasonable basis, the adequacy of the planning process itself.

Comments that failed to meet the above description were considered nonsubstantive. Some comments received throughout the process expressed personal opinions or preferences, had little relevance to the adequacy or accuracy of the Draft RMP, or represented commentary regarding resource management without any real connection to the document being reviewed.

Although not responded to, opinions, feelings, and preferences for one element or one alternative over another without supporting rationale or comments of a personal or philosophical nature were read and considered.

A review of the 322 substantive comments received revealed a high level of interest about the management of sage-grouse (Greater Sage-Grouse: 96 comments, 30 percent; and National Greater Sage-Grouse Strategy: 11 comments, 3 percent), other special status species (33 comments, 10 percent), general wildlife concerns (22 comments, 7 percent), water resources (20 comments, 6 percent), and air resources (16 comments, 5 percent). NEPA and FLPMA compliance also received high level of interest (17 comments, 5 percent, and 10 comments, 3 percent, respectively), as did energy and mineral development (leasable minerals: 12 comments, 4 percent; locatable minerals: 4 comments, 1 percent; and salable minerals: 3 comments, 1 percent). Topics unique to this amendment were recreation management at the Fort Meade ACEC (recreation: 11 comments, 3 percent) and hazardous materials at the abandoned Black Hills Army Depot (facilities and public safety: 7 comments, 2 percent). Other topics included ACECs and special designations (8 comments, 2 percent), social and economic concerns (8 comments, 2 percent), climate change (7 comments, 2 percent), vegetation (7 comments, 2 percent), land tenure and ROWs (lands and realty: 6 comments, 2 percent), travel management (6 comments, 2 percent), fish and aquatics (4 comments, 1 percent), visual resources and forestry (4 comments, 1 percent), cultural resources and livestock grazing (2 comment, less than 1 percent), paleontological resources (2 comments, less than 1 percent), soil resources (2 comments, less than 1 percent), noxious weeds (2 comments, 1 percent), and tribal interests (1 comment, less than 1 percent). See **Table 5-3**, Number of Comments on the Draft RMP by Category.

Table 5-3 Number of Comments on the Draft RMP by Category	
<i>Topic</i>	<i>Number of Comments</i>
Greater Sage-Grouse	96
Other special status species	33
Wildlife (general)	22
Water resources	20
NEPA	17
Air resources	16
Leasable minerals	12
National Greater Sage-grouse Strategy	11
Recreation	11
FLPMA	10
ACECs and special designations	8
Social and economic concerns	8
Climate change	7
Facilities and public safety	7
Vegetation	7
Lands and realty	6
Travel management	6
Fish and aquatics	4
Locatable minerals	4
Visual resources and forestry	4

Table 5-3 Number of Comments on the Draft RMP by Category	
<i>Topic</i>	<i>Number of Comments</i>
Salable minerals	3
Cultural resources and livestock grazing	2
Noxious weeds	2
Paleontological resources	2
Soil resources	2
Tribal interests	1
Wilderness	1
Total	322

The comments received on the Draft RMP did not differ significantly from issues raised during public scoping, and no new issues that had not been previously addressed during the planning period were raised. In some cases, commenters disagreed with the action(s) proposed in the Preferred Alternative to address issues or achieve goals. In these cases the alternatives were reviewed and changes made when appropriate. In many cases, comments expressed a desire for very specific implementation level (project level) details to be included in the RMP. As described in Chapter 1 and 2, the RMP provides general guidance and identifies allowable uses and allocations but is not meant to address all details about individual projects. A separate environmental review is conducted for specific projects at the implementation level to address these details. Some comments spanned several topical areas and included a discussion about a resource use or activity and listed concerns about the resources that would be impacted by the use, or conversely, the impact that restrictions would have on resource uses or activities. All substantive comments organized by resource, resource use, or EIS planning regulation, with corresponding responses from the BLM, can be found in Appendix W. Comments related to editorial changes, extension requests, and non-substantive comments were not included in Appendix W. See **Table 5-4**, Overview of Comments by Category, for a brief summary of the content of the comments by topic.

Table 5-4 Overview of Comments by Category	
<i>Topic</i>	<i>Overview</i>
ACECs and special designations	Comments questioned the analysis of the proposed ACECs in document, questioned livestock grazing management in Fort Meade ACEC, requested greater incorporation of impacts to the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail, indicated that a sage-grouse PHMA ACEC would not benefit sage-grouse and stated that actions to designate or identify additional ACECs, wild and scenic rivers segments, or primitive recreation areas were not included.
Air resources	Comments recommended technical changes and clarifications on the Air Quality Technical Support Document, the Air Resource management plan, Chapter 3, and Chapter 4. They also asked for confirmation of future air quality monitoring commitments, and challenged the authority to establish an air quality and management program separate from the State of South Dakota.
Climate change	Comments recommended identifying which climate models were used (if any), incorporating additional information from landscape-scale planning documents and assessment related to climate change, implementing additional planning measures to increase ecosystem resilience to climate change, incorporate “downstream” greenhouse gas emissions, and better explain the effects of climate change on water resources and wildlife.

Table 5-4
Overview of Comments by Category

<i>Topic</i>	<i>Overview</i>
Cultural resources	Comments requested that the BLM consider impacts from livestock grazing on cultural resources in the planning area, provide tolerance parameters to ensure protection of these resources.
Facilities and public safety	Comments questioned who would be responsible for the additional cost to bury powerlines, interested in measures to reduce eroinite risks (dust from a hazardous mineral) and uranium mining, and voiced strong concerns over oil and gas exploration near the Black Hills Army Depot due to the presence of buried chemical weapons on the site.
Fish and aquatics	Comments suggested changes throughout the document related to Fish and Aquatics sections and additional justification for land use stipulations related to energy development near aquatic environments, wanted more discussion about lotic systems, questioned the need for a ¼ mile NSO buffer around fisheries.
FLPMA	Comments focused on the need for the RMP to comply with the Federal Land Policy Management Act (FLPMA), including the multiple use mandate, the right to access and develop valid existing rights, preventing undue or unnecessary degradation, and consistency with other state and local plans. Comments also noted that land use stipulations need to be the least restrictive as required under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act and concurrent with existing management plans under other federal agencies.
Forestry	Wanted salvage logging management to be revised to leave adequate habitat for the black-backed woodpecker.
Greater Sage-Grouse	Comments focused on the relationship between powerlines and predation of sage-grouse, stated the need for a wider array of alternatives for sage-grouse management, requested a more in-depth analysis of potential impacts, recommended new studies regarding sage-grouse, argued that the definition of core habitats is not accurate, made management recommendations for sage-grouse protection and recovery (including monitoring and adaptive management), found the incorporation of NTT and WAFWA conservation recommendations to be inadequate, wanted a comparison of RMP actions and the recommendation of the Sage-Grouse COT Report, questioned allowing prescribed fire in sage-grouse Priority Habitat Management Areas (PHMAs), recommended using the State of SD sage-grouse core areas as PHMAs, wanted residual grass requirements in sage-grouse habitat, concerned about habitat connectivity and other habitat needs, questioned the impacts of power lines on sage-grouse, concerned that management actions in PHMAs would be applied to private land, concerned about the impact of PHMA restrictions to mineral development, and suggested clarifications to the document. There were also a variety of comments comparing the actions in the Alternatives to the recommendations in the Sage-Grouse COT report. Refer to National sage-grouse comments, livestock grazing and minerals section of this table for other comments related to sage-grouse.
Lands and realty	Comments wanted more information on potential land tenure adjustments in the field office and near the National Cemetary, recommended acquisition of land near Fort Meade, wanted a better analysis of future energy corridors and infrastructure in the area, and a discussion on impacts on humans from ELF waves, concerned about a possible net loss of public lands in SD.
Leasable minerals	Comments expressed concern about tracts that had been deferred for a long time because of sage-grouse and tribal concerns, argued that the monitoring requirements and the potential for waivers, exceptions, and modifications of lease agreements are inadequate to protect wildlife habitats, noted the lack of data linking oil and gas development to lek attendance, argued that lek buffers in the alternatives are not adequate to protect sage-

Table 5-4
Overview of Comments by Category

<i>Topic</i>	<i>Overview</i>
	grouse, requested that the National Cemetery be protected from nearby energy development indicated that the least restrictive action was not utilized to protect resources, concerned that sage-grouse restrictions would limit development, stressed the importance of notifying the surface land owner and livestock grazing leasees of the intent to develop any underlying minerals, and suggested clarifications to the document.
Livestock Grazing	Comments included the desire for a no grazing alternative, more specific, measurable terms and conditions for grazing authorizations. Concerned about differences between grazing strategies between BLM and the State of SD, Concerned about inconsistent monitoring methods as a means to evaluate impacts to sage-grouse, wanted more detailed monitoring of grazing impacts, recommended specific objectives or limits on livestock use and objectives for rangelands, discussed the need to carefully consider the resources that the standards for rangeland health are intended to protect, and desired close coordination with other agencies and stakeholders.
Locatable minerals	Comments wanted more incorporation of water issues related to the nearby Dewey-Burdock uranium project (addressed through a separate EIS), wanted a better explanation of how pegmatite, shale, and gypsum mining would be addressed under the plan, and argued that the preferred alternative does not follow mining regulations since it causes unnecessary and undue degradation to sage-grouse habitat.
National Greater Sage-Grouse Strategy	Comments questioned the reliance on the National Technical Team (NTT) report, questioned why some aspects of the alternatives deviate from the NTT recommendations, believed that flawed assumptions were brought forward from the NTT report, claimed the Draft RMP did not analyze the complete Sage-Grouse Recovery Alternative, and voiced concerns regarding the mitigation and monitoring requirements in the Draft RMP.
NEPA	Comments questioned whether the Draft RMP met the standards of NEPA, including adequately analyzing a reasonable range of alternatives, the inclusion of relevant scientific references, the inability for the reader to easily compare differences between alternatives, believed that the analysis of environmental consequences was inadequate and mitigation measures did not demonstrate that impacts would be reduced to an insignificant level and wanted more adaptive management built into the RMP.
Noxious weeds	Comments suggested noxious weed list should be updated to reflect recent updates to the State of SD noxious weed list and voiced concern that livestock grazing may be spreading cheatgrass.
Social and economic concerns	Comments focused on the economics of grazing in the area and the need for a more detailed Environmental Justice analysis for the affected area and nearby tribal populations.
Special status species	Comments questioned the “active” status of raptor nests and their associated protections, questioned the baseline information and land use stipulations for different special status species, voiced concern over the range of black-footed prairie dogs and prevalence of plague in the planning area, suggested additional species to be added to the section and updates to sensitive species lists, and wanted additional language to address black-backed wood peckers and long-eared bats, wanted more details about species associated with prairie dog colonies, recommended more discussion about special status species, and suggested additional references. Refer to sage-grouse sections for sage-grouse comments.
Paleontological resources	Comments stressed the need for flexible paleontological resource management during ground disturbing activities and for a definition of “significant paleontological sites”.
Recreation	Desired specific details about implementation level (project level), asked for clarification on trapping policy, noted that the trapping policy outlined in the Draft RMP is inconsistent with state law, suggested additional language, wanted maps of road inventories and

Table 5-4
Overview of Comments by Category

<i>Topic</i>	<i>Overview</i>
	classes, recommended a public/private effort for maintaining recreational shooting areas, requested additional signage in recreation areas, requested the continued implementation of the 1996 Fort Meade Recreation Area ACEC Management Plan and wanted additional trails constructed to connect routes and improve the trail system at Fort Meade.
Salable minerals	Commenters requested clarification on “unacceptable level of change”, impacts of permitted removal of flat rocks that act as reptile habitat, and “special considerations involving salable minerals”.
Soil resources	Comments recommended the use of sediment and nutrient pollutant models to improve the impacts analysis and suggested edits to the relationship between soil erosion and livestock grazing.
Travel management	Comments voiced an interest in keeping public trails and roads open, requested clarification on cross-country travel allowed by livestock grazing leasees, requested clarification on non-motorized recreation, and requested a change from the the proposed 100-foot buffer from roadways for off-road travel and camping to 300 feet to be consistent with nearby USFS lands.
Tribal interests	The comment requested that oral histories of native indiginious people be taken into consideration.
Vegetation	Comments requested clarification of management actions, consideration of downed materials and snags as habitat, and additional references for vegetation.
Visual resources	Comments noted the difficulty in meeting VRM requirements because of the highly intermingled land ownership pattern and potential adverse impacts to lessees and additional workload for BLM staff. .
Water resources	Comments suggested additional baseline and impact analysis information be added, suggested additional land use stipulations be implemented to protect water resources, made recommendations for monitoring and an adaptive management plans, wanted more discussion on how state water quality standards would be met, recommended grazing practices to limit impacts to water quality and oil and gas practices to limit impacts to water quality, wanted the use of sediment and nutrient pollutant models to improve the impacts analysis and requested increased protections for sensitive areas, such as perennial seeps, springs and wetlands and source water protection areas.
Wilderness	Comment wanted to see a review of current unaltered lands for a wilderness designation.
Wildlife (general)	Commented noted concerns about proposed prairie dog management, protections for other bird species and bats, predator control, coordination with other agencies on habitat management plans, wanted a specific definition of active verses inactive raptor nests, wanted different restrictions (more or less depending on comment), concerned that more wildlife surveys and monitoring is needed, recommended more discussion on various wildlife species, and suggested adding additional references.

Response to Comments

Complete responses, including rationale and any associated changes made in the Final RMP/EIS, can be found in Appendix W. A brief overview of changes to the document are included below:

- Some actions that were not included in the preferred alternative but evaluated in the other alternatives are now included in the proposed alternative based on public comment. Some key changes of this type include a change in management in the abandoned Black Hills Army Depot. Previously a No Surface Occupancy stipulation had been evaluated in the Preferred Alternative for the Depot. This stipulation has been changed to a closure of this area in

the Preferred Alternative because of substantive comments about poorly documented hazardous materials in this area.

- The 100 foot restriction of off-road vehicle travel for camping was changed to 300 feet in the Preferred Alternative because of comments from the USFS and the need to have consistency in direction between the BLM and USFS.
- Sage-Grouse Priority Habitat Management Areas was expanded in the Preferred Alternative because the SD Game, Fish and Parks recently identified core areas for sage-grouse that were much larger than the PHMAs in the Draft RMP. The State recommended the core areas be considered for special management emphasis. Sage-grouse PHMAs in the Preferred Alternative are much larger than in the Draft RMP and match the State GFP core areas (refer to Map 2-5). Additional details about monitoring and adaptive management approaches to manage sage-grouse habitat was added to Chapter 2 and Appendix V-2 and V-6.
- Other changes to the Preferred Alternative include the removal of a one quarter mile NSO around sharptail grouse leks, addition of a two mile Conditional Surface Use (CSU) stipulation instead of a two mile Timing Limit around sharptail leks, and a change from a one mile NSO stipulation around sage grouse leks in general habitat to a six tenth of a mile NSO stipulation around leks in general habitat.
- Chapter 2 sections on monitoring, adaptive management, and mitigation for sage-grouse was revised to include more specific details.
- Table 2-3 (Summary of Impacts) in Chapter 2 and Chapter 4 was updated to include more detailed analysis of impacts.
- Additions based on internal and public comments include the addition of Tier 4 (low emission engine requirement) Lease Notice requirement for engines used to extract oil and gas, Sprague's pipit oil and gas Lease Notice, an NSO stipulation in source water protection areas, and updates to BMPs.
- Additional protection was added for National Trails through a one half mile NSO stipulation, a one half mile Renewable Energy ROW exclusion and a one half mile ROW avoidance area for other types of ROWs.
- All of the comments citing editorial changes to the document were reviewed and incorporated as appropriate. Protection of habitat for species with limited or no habitat on BLM administered lands has been added in cases where potential habitat may exist. This was done to offer protection if habitat is found or a species begins using previously unoccupied areas. The Proposed RMP has been edited and revised to fix typographic errors, missing references, definitions, acronyms, and other needed clarifications.

Refer to Chapter 2 Narrative Section for additional details about changes.

Future Public Involvement

The Proposed RMP considered all substantive comments received during the 90-day public comment period for the Draft RMP. Members of the public with standing will have the opportunity to protest the Proposed RMP during the specified 30-day protest period. See the Dear Reader letter for instructions. The Record of Decision will be issued by the BLM following a Governor's Consistency Review and resolution of protests.

Consultation and Coordination

Tribal Consultation

In accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act and in recognition of the government-to-government relationship between tribes and the federal government, letters were sent to tribal governments and officials on March 7, 2007. These letters provided information about the Proposed RMP/Final EIS and provided an opportunity for recipients to partner with the BLM as a cooperating agency. While no tribes became an official cooperating agency, coordination through letters and updates has continued throughout the process. During the Draft RMP planning or during the comment period for the Draft RMP and EIS, the South Dakota Field Office met with and provided a Power Point presentation and briefing about the Draft RMP and EIS to representatives of the following tribes:

- Pine Ridge Sioux
- Three Affiliated Tribes (Mandan-Hidatsa-Arikara)
- Crow Creek Sioux

- Rosebud Sioux
- Standing Rock Sioux
- Cheyenne River Sioux
- Santee Sioux
- Lower Brule Sioux
- Northern Cheyenne
- Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux

Table 5-5, Meetings with Tribal Governments/Officials about the South Dakota RMP, lists the meetings that have taken place to date.

Table 5-5 Meetings with Tribal Governments/Officials about the South Dakota RMP	
<i>Date</i>	<i>Meeting Details</i>
July 25, 2007	RMP Consultation. Met with from the Lower Brule and Standing Rock Reservations in Rapid City, South Dakota. Discussions included a PowerPoint presentation on the RMP planning process, discussion about the preliminary issues and concerns that had been identified, and a question/answer session.
December 11, 2008	Met with Mandan Hidatsa Nation Resources (MHA) Committee from MDA in New Town, North Dakota. Discussions included a PowerPoint presentation on the RMP planning process, discussion about preliminary issues and concerns that had been identified, and a question/answer session.
January 10, 2008	RMP Consultation. Met with MDA Tribal Council in New Town, North Dakota. Discussions included the ND and SD RMPs, including presentation by ND and SD Field Managers on the RMP planning process, preliminary issues and concerns, and a question/answer session. Much of the discussion focused on oil and gas development.
March 13, 2008	RMP Consultation. Met with Natural Resources staff of the Northern Cheyenne in Lame Deer, Montana. Discussions included the RMP planning process, discussion about preliminary issues and concerns that had been identified, and a question/answer session.
March 25, 2008	Met with tribal representatives in Rapid City, South Dakota to discuss the RMP planning process and GCC Dacotah Cement limestone mining. The Rosebud Sioux Tribe Treaty Commission was present.
October 17, 2012	Presentation and discussion about the SD RMP was held at a Tribal meeting in Spearfish, SD. The Three Affiliated Tribes (Mandan-Hidatsa-Arikara), Northern Cheyenne, Crow Creek, Lower Brule, Rosebud, Pine Ridge Oglala, Cheyenne River, Yankton, Santee and Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux attended this meeting.
May,30 2013	Presentation and discussion about the SD RMP was held at the Lower Brule Reservation. Elders from the Standing Rock, Cheyenne River, Crow Creek, and Lower Brule Sioux Tribes were present.
May 14, 2013	Field trip with area tribes to look at and discuss potential cultural sites at Fort Meade ACEC.
May 15, 2013	Field Trip with area tribes to discuss oil and gas leasing in Harding County.
June 5th and 6th	The SD Field Manager called the Crow Creek, Lower Brule, Oglala, Rosebud, Santee, Standing Rock, Yankton and Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate, Flandreau Sioux Tribes, the Three Affiliated Tribes, Crow Tribe of Montana, the Fort Peck Sioux and the Northern Cheyenne. The purpose of the call was to inform them of the June 14 th release of the Draft SD RMP/EIS and see if any tribes wanted to meeting about the Draft RMP/EIS. None of the tribes expressed interest in a meeting at this time.
June 18-19	The SD Field Office Cultural Resource Specialist called the Crow Creek, Lower Brule, Oglala, Rosebud, Santee, Standing Rock, Yankton and Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate, Flandreau Sioux Tribes, the Three Affiliated Tribes, Crow Tribe of Montana, the Fort

Table 5-5 Meetings with Tribal Governments/Officials about the South Dakota RMP	
<i>Date</i>	<i>Meeting Details</i>
	Peck Sioux and the Northern Cheyenne. She asked the tribes if they would like a meeting or needed additional information about the draft RMP/EIS. The Rosebud Sioux later called back and requested that BLM come to a tribal council meeting and discuss the RMP.
August 14, 2013	Presentation and discussion about the SD RMP was held at the Rosebud Sioux Tribal Council Meeting.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Consultation

Federal agencies are required to comply with provisions of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended. This includes a requirement to consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) on any action that may affect species listed as threatened and endangered or result in destruction or adverse modification of habitat designated as critical for listed species. In addition, federal agencies must confer with the USFWS on any action that is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any species proposed to be listed or any action that may result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat proposed to be designated for listed species.

This Proposed RMP/Final EIS is considered to be a major project, and this document describes potential impacts to threatened and endangered species as a result of management actions proposed in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. Contacts were made with the USFWS early in the planning process, and an initial list of federally listed, threatened or endangered plant, animal, or fish species or habitats present in the planning area was provided in 2008. Updated lists have been provided throughout the process. Seven federally listed threatened species and seven endangered species are known to occur or use habitat within the planning area. In addition, three candidate species are known to occur in the planning area.

While the USFWS declined to serve as a formal cooperating agency during the planning process, informal meetings were held between BLM, SDFO and the SD Field Office of USFWS in July 2010 to discuss issues and alternatives. Representatives from the SD Field Office of FWS attended BLM briefing to State of SD agencies in 2012 and 2013 and provided input during these briefings. On January 17, 2014 representatives from the BLM SDFO met with the SD Field Office of FWS in Wall, SD to discuss comments that were provided by SDFO of FWS. As part of the RMP planning process, a biological assessment will be submitted to FWS. **Table 5-6**, Federally Listed Threatened and Endangered Species or Candidate Species that May Occur within the South Dakota Planning Area Includes Proposed, Threatened or Endangered Species, lists the federally endangered, threatened, proposed, or candidate species known to occur or use resources in the planning area.

Table 5-6 Federally Listed Threatened and Endangered Species or Candidate Species that May Occur within the South Dakota Planning Area Includes Proposed, Threatened or Endangered Species			
<i>Common Name</i>	<i>Scientific Name</i>	<i>Federal Status</i>	<i>State Status</i>
Birds			
Interior Least Tern	<i>Sterna antillarum athalassos</i>	Federally Listed Endangered	State Endangered
Piping Plover	<i>Charadrius melodus</i>	Federally Listed Threatened	State Threatened
Whooping Crane	<i>Grus americana</i>	Federally Listed Endangered	State Endangered
Greater Sage-Grouse	<i>Centrocercus urophasianus</i>	Candidate	
Sprague's Pipit	<i>Anthus spragueii</i>	Candidate	
Rufa Red Knot	<i>Calidris canutus rufa</i>	Federally Listed Threatened	

Table 5-6
Federally Listed Threatened and Endangered Species or
Candidate Species that May Occur within the South Dakota Planning Area
Includes Proposed, Threatened or Endangered Species

<i>Common Name</i>	<i>Scientific Name</i>	<i>Federal Status</i>	<i>State Status</i>
Mammals			
Black-footed Ferret	<i>Mustela nigripes</i>	Federally Listed Endangered	State Endangered
Gray Wolf	<i>Canis lupus</i>	Federally Listed Endangered in part of the planning area west of Missouri River	
Northern long-eared bat	<i>Myotis septentrionalis</i>	Federally Listed Threatened	
Fish			
Pallid Sturgeon	<i>Scaphirhynchus albus</i>	Federally Listed Endangered	State Endangered
Topeka Shiner	<i>Notropis topeka</i>	Federally Listed Endangered	
Insects			
American Burying Beetle	<i>Nicrophorus americanus</i>	Federally Listed Endangered	
Dakota Skipper	<i>Hesperia dacotae</i>	Federally Listed Threatened	
Poweshiek Skipperling	<i>Oarisma poweshiek</i>	Federally Listed Endangered	
Mussels			
Scaleshell Mussel	<i>Leptodea leptodon</i>	Federally Listed Endangered	
Higgins Eye Mussel	<i>Lampsilis higginsii</i>	Federally Listed Endangered	

State Historic Preservation Office Consultation

The BLM cultural resource management program operates in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800, which provides specific procedures for consultation between the BLM and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). Coordination and consultation with the SHPO will continue throughout the South Dakota RMP planning process. The SHPO participated as a cooperating agency and was consulted early during Proposed RMP/Final EIS development concerning cultural resources that may be affected.

Air Quality Consultation

On February 22, 2012, the BLM hosted a conference call concerning the SDFO RMP/EIS air quality impact analysis with an Air Quality Technical Workgroup consisting of representatives from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), U.S. Forest Service (USFS), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and the U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Park Service (NPS). This call formally initiated collaborative planning and review activities under the Memorandum of Understanding among the U.S. Department of Agriculture, U.S. Department of the Interior, and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Regarding Air Quality Analysis and Mitigation for Federal Oil and Gas Decisions through the National Environmental Policy Act Process. During the February 22, 2012 call, the BLM presented background information on existing air quality within the planning area, predicted oil and gas activities, estimated emissions associated with the RFD, and a proposed air quality analysis approach for the SDFO RMP revision. The BLM solicited comments from each of the MOU agencies and continues to coordinate with these agencies throughout the development process for the SDFO RMP revision.

Resource Advisory Council

Resource Advisory Councils (RACs) were created in 1995 to advise the BLM on land management programs and issues. RAC members are chosen by the Secretary of the Interior in consultation with the governor of the state in which they serve. One of the strengths of the RAC is their ability to provide assistance and input on a wide variety of land use issues. The

Dakotas RAC consists of a 15-member advisory group who represent three broad interest categories: commodity interests, non-commodity interests, and government/academic interests.

The first Dakotas RAC meeting on the South Dakota RMP was held in the fall of 2007 and served as an introduction to the RMP planning process. The BLM made a presentation on the RMP process that highlighted planning area components and issues, an overview of the preliminary planning criteria, and project status. Following the initial meeting, Dakotas RAC members were updated on the RMP process and progress every six months. Subsequent briefings focused on key issues and milestones during the planning process, including Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs), information from cooperating agency meetings and public involvement efforts, and sage-grouse management. The RAC continued to be involved through briefings and updates during Proposed RMP/Final EIS preparation. An Instructor of American Indian Studies program at Black Hills State University who serves as a RAC member representing the public at large attended cooperating agency meetings on a regular basis from 2008 to 2012. Other RAC members attended meeting periodically.

Cooperating Agencies

A cooperating agency is any federal, state, or local government agency or Native American tribe that enters into an agreement with the lead federal agency to assist in development of an environmental analysis. Early in the planning process, the BLM mailed letters to federal, tribal, state and local representatives, inviting them to participate as cooperating agencies for the South Dakota RMP. Seven agencies accepted the invitation to participate, including:

- Butte County Commission
- Custer County Commission
- Harding County Commission
- Lawrence County Commission
- Meade County Commission
- Pennington County Commission
- State of South Dakota

Some of the agencies and tribes that declined to serve as participating agencies, as well as those agencies or tribes that did not respond, will continue to be involved and informed throughout the planning process through mailings and project status updates.

Eleven cooperating agency meetings were held from August 2008 to January 2013 to coordinate and collaborate in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS development. The primary role of cooperating agencies is to provide input during the RMP/EIS process on issues for which they have special expertise or jurisdiction. Representatives met with the BLM periodically throughout the planning process to discuss issues as a group. Cooperating agencies are expected to participate in the planning process at the earliest possible time and are available to enhance the interdisciplinary capability of the planning effort by providing specific information throughout the NEPA process. Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) were developed and entered into between the SDFO and cooperating agencies. The MOUs set forth roles and responsibilities for cooperating agencies for RMP/EIS collaborative planning and production. Agencies coordinate and work with the BLM, sharing knowledge and resources to achieve desired outcomes for BLM lands and communities within statutory and regulatory frameworks.

The USFWS and USFS are cooperators for the larger Greater Sage-grouse planning effort, which includes the South Dakota RMP. The MOU between the BLM, USFWS and USFS was signed in March 2012.

The BLM is aware that there are specific State laws and local plans relevant to aspects of public land management that are discrete from, and independent of, Federal law. However, BLM is bound by Federal law. As a consequence, there may be inconsistencies that cannot be reconciled. The FLPMA and its implementing regulations require that BLM's land use plans be consistent with State and local plans only if those plans are consistent with the purposes, policies, and programs of federal laws and regulations applicable to public lands. Where State and local plans conflict with the purposes, policies, and programs of Federal law, there will be an inconsistency that cannot be resolved. While County and Federal planning processes, under FLPMA, are required to as integrated and consistent as practical, the Federal agency planning process is not bound by or subject to County plans, planning processes, or planning stipulations.

Plan Distribution

Since initial scoping the BLM has maintained a comprehensive mailing list of individuals; businesses; organizations; and federal, state, tribal, and local government representatives interested in development of the South Dakota RMP.

This Proposed RMP/Final EIS is available on the BLM website at http://www.blm.gov/mt/st/en/fo/south_dakota_field/rmp.html and is available for public review at the following locations: Montana State Office (Billings, Montana), SDFO (Belle Fourche, South Dakota), Miles City Field Office (Miles City, Montana), and the Sioux Ranger District (Camp Crook, South Dakota).

Printed or CD copies of the document have been distributed to the government agencies, businesses, and organizations listed below. This Proposed RMP/Final EIS, either on CD or in printed format, was also mailed to individuals who requested a copy. CD copies of the RMP were sent to all individuals, groups, and agencies on the mailing list for the National Sage Grouse Planning Strategy.

Federal Government

- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers – Omaha District
- U.S. Department Energy – Office of Environmental Management
- U.S. Department of Justice
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- U.S. Geological Survey
- U.S. Department of Agriculture – Farm Service Agency
- USDA – Forest Service
- USDA – Natural Resources Conservation Service
- USDI – Bureau of Indian Affairs
- USDI – Bureau of Reclamation
- USDI – Field Solicitor’s Office
- USDI – Fish and Wildlife Service
- USDI – National Park Service

State Government

South Dakota

A copy of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS was sent to the State Cooperating Agency representative for the SDFO RMP, the South Dakota Office of the Governor, South Dakota Department of Agriculture, South Dakota Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), and South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks (GFP).

In addition, a notice that a Proposed RMP/Final EIS has been completed was sent to the following State of South Dakota agencies, offices, and departments:

- Office of the Governor
- Army National Guard
- Department of Agriculture
- Department of Environment and Natural Resources
- Department of Public Safety
- Department of Revenue and Regulation
- Department of Tourism and State Development
- Department of Transportation
- Division of Resource Conservation and Forestry
- Division of Wildland Fire
- Office of School and Public Lands
- Public Utilities Commission
- State Historic Preservation Office
- State Lands

This Proposed RMP was mailed to the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming. A notice that this Proposed RMP is available was mailed to the following departments in states that border western South Dakota.

Montana

- Montana Department of Agriculture
- Montana Department of Natural Resource and Conservation, Forestry Division

- Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks

North Dakota

- North Dakota Department of Agriculture
- North Dakota Forest Service
- North Dakota Game and Fish Department

Wyoming

- Wyoming Department of Agriculture
- Wyoming Game and Fish
- Wyoming State Forestry Division

County/Local Government

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Butte County Commission • Custer County Commission • Fall River County Commission • Harding County Commission • Lawrence County Commission • Meade County Commission • Pennington County Commission • Perkins County Commission • Stanley County Commission | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City of Belle Fourche • City of Buffalo • City of Custer • City of Deadwood • City of Fort Pierre • City of Lead • City of Pierre • City of Sturgis • City of Wall |
|---|--|

Tribal Government

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three Affiliated Tribes (North Dakota) • Cheyenne River Sioux • Crow Creek Sioux • Lower Brule Sioux • Pine Ridge Oglala Sioux • Rosebud Sioux | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northern Cheyenne (Montana) • Standing Rock Sioux • Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux • Yankton Sioux • Santee Sioux (Nebraska) |
|---|---|

Congressional

- Congresswoman Kristie Noem
- Senator John Thune
- Senator Tim Johnson

Businesses

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barrick Gold of North Amer. Inc. • Continental Resources • Petro-Hunt • Western Land Services • American Colloid • West River Eagle | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Howes Grazing Association • Moreau Grazing Association • Powertech Uranium Corp. • GCC Dacotah Cement • Wharf Resources • Wind Quarry LLC |
|--|--|

Organizations

- American Wind Energy Association
- Badlands RC&D
- Belle Fourche River Watershed Partnership
- Biodiversity Conservation Alliance
- Black Hills Back Country Horsemen of SD
- Black Hills Mountain Bike Association
- Black Hills RC&D
- Black Hills Regional Multiple Use Coalition
- Black Hills Sportsmen
- Black Hills Wranglers
- Defenders of Wildlife
- Institute of Range and American Mustang
- National Wild Turkey Federation
- North Central RC&D
- Prairie Hills Audubon Society
- Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation
- Sierra Club Black Hills Group
- South Dakota Association of Conservation Districts
- South Dakota Cattlemen's Association
- South Dakota Farm Bureau
- South Dakota Grassland Coalition
- South Dakota Off Highway Vehicle Coalition
- South Dakota Public Lands Council
- South Dakota Cattlemen's Association
- South Dakota Sheepgrowers Association
- South Dakota Stockgrowers Association
- South Dakota Trail Riders
- South Dakota Wildlife Federation
- The Nature Conservancy
- Tatanka RC&D Council
- World Wildlife Fund

List of Preparers

Core Interdisciplinary Team

Mitch Iverson

Professional Discipline:
Responsibility:

RMP Team Lead (Project Manager)

Elizabeth Stiller

Professional Discipline:
Responsibility:

Forester

Forestry, Forest and Woodland Products, Recreation, VRM, and Special Designations

Brenda Shierts

Professional Discipline:
Responsibility:

Archeologist

Cultural and Paleontological Resources

Gerald Moller

Professional Discipline:
Responsibility:

Range Technician

Invasive Species

Travis Lipp

Professional Discipline:
Responsibility:

Fire Management Specialist

Wildland Fire and Ecology and Management

Russell Pigors

Professional Discipline:
Responsibility:

Physical Scientist

Air Quality, Minerals, Public Safety, Soil, and Groundwater

Joan Trent

Professional Discipline:
Responsibility:

Sociologist

Social

John Thompson

Professional Discipline:
Responsibility:

Economist, Planner and Environmental Coordinator

Economics and NEPA Assistance

Susan Bassett

Professional Discipline:
Responsibility:

Air Resource Specialist

Air Resources, Climate Change

Rebecca Newton

Professional Discipline:
Responsibility:

Wildlife Biologist

Wildlife, Special Status Species, Aquatics, and Fisheries

Carmen Drieling

Professional Discipline:
Responsibility:

Rangeland Management

Rangeland Management, Grazing, Surface Water

Jennifer Frazer

Professional Discipline:
Responsibility:

Natural Resource Specialist (GIS)
GIS Analysis, Map Production

Interdisciplinary Team Support**Renee Johnson**

Professional Discipline:
Responsibility:

Renewable Energy Project Manager
Renewable Energy

Wendy Velman

Professional Discipline:
Responsibility:

Botanist
Special Status Plants

Kay Haight

Professional Discipline:
Responsibility:

Technical Writer-Editor
Document Editing and Layout

Management Team

Jamie Connell
Kate Kitchell
Diane Friez
Marian Atkins

State Director
Associate State Director
District Manager, Eastern Montana/Dakotas District
Field Manager, South Dakota Field Office

Contractor Assistance

ARCADIS
EMPSi
Logan Simpson Design
MidDakota Vegetation
Wyoming State Office Reservoir
Management Group

Soil and Water technical review
Technical Review and Assistance
Visual Resource Management Inventory
Preliminary Road Inventory
Reasonable Fooreseeable Development Scenario for Oil and Gas Activities on
Bureau Managed Lands in the South Dakota Study Area